

T/V.I/M-1
2 June 1965

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD

COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

Task Team V - Biographies

Working Group on Name Searching Activities

Minutes of the First Meeting, 19 May 1965

Members or Their Representatives Present

Army	- Mr. Paul Anderson, Chairman
CSC	- Mr. Pearley Buck
FBI	- Mr. Earl McCoy
I&NS	- Mr. John L. Keefe
CSS	- Mr. Robert M. Landau, Secretary

1. Because of the expected conflicts of schedules, the working group first agreed on the time and place of the next two meetings: At the Civil Service Commission, Room 3462, Monday, 24 May, 0900; and at the FBI, Room 6525, Wednesday, 9 June, 0900.

2. The Chairman of this new working group first reviewed the Terms of Reference of Task Team V and quickly went over the facts that the Team has obtained so far. The Chairman gave each member an opportunity to express his opinion as to what the working group should accomplish. For a while, the group covered a wide range of subject matters of interest to the biographic activities of the USIB agencies with the general concensus being reached that one of the major elements of information essential for Task Team V was the development of time and service factors in name checking between agencies. Reference was made to the paper prepared by [REDACTED] on this subject in March and it was agreed that this paper was too general to be of sufficient use to Task Team V in fulfilling its obligations in reporting to CODIB. The conversation centered on the possibility of a careful analysis of the interagency name check activities (NAC Program) as one of the most prominent identifiable systems in operation in the security/counter-intelligence portion of the biographic intelligence world. The group looked at the National Agency Check (NAC) activities from several angles. What are the procedures? How important is content? Is the use of a multitude of request forms necessarily bad? Should an attempt be made to standardize on forms? What is a "typical request"? Should we

GROUP I
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification.

- 2 -

each prepare a flow diagram of a "typical request" from the requestor to the various biographic holdings and back to the requestor? What is the difference between "employment type" versus "operational type" name checks both in terms of quantity and quality of response (e.g., different depths of searches, different combination of auxiliary index checks).

3. The Immigration Service member displayed a list of about 45 different name check request forms by number and name which his agency now receives from other agencies. He pointed out that different forms trigger different types of searches in terms of what files are searched as well as the depth of search. The other members cited a somewhat similar variety of responses based on the character of the request. These descriptions pointed up the extremely complex activity which takes place in the interagency name check system.

4. The group questioned whether security classification is normally a determinate for the way in which a case is handled in regards to depth of search, what files are searched, and so on. It was generally agreed that security classification does not affect these factors. It was also the consensus that priorities are assigned in all represented agencies based on type of case, designation by requestor, etc.

5. Considerable time was spent on the question of what is the meaning of a "no record" response. It was agreed that there are at least two that can be identified. First is the kind of response when there is no record in the index as searched by whatever criteria has been agreed upon. The second kind of no record response is that which results when a possible identification is made in a secondary search (such as when a dossier is consulted) with the subsequent determination that the record is not identical to the person upon which a request was submitted. The FBI member pointed out, and it was suggested by others, that in all cases, the "no record" response is predicated upon the limitation of the amount of information supplied about the individual by the requestor. Consideration was given to possible determination of the ratio of these two kinds of "no records" to each other as well as to the total number of names checked.

6. Thought was given to the relationship between the figures already submitted by the team members on the number of requests received from other agencies (about 14,200 daily) and the number of name checks that are being requested by each agency. The latter has not yet been determined. The point was quickly developed that one name check initiated by an agency, such as the Civil Service Commission produces many (an average of seven in the case of CSC) name checks around the Community because of certain legal or procedural requirements. The point was then made that in this inquiry, the team would be looking to a new source of information to satisfy the need to know how long it takes the various agencies to supply information about named individuals to each other. The sources of such information would be the points in the agencies where the requests originate.

- 3 -

7. The members speculated on whether the development of figures by the members present in their agencies might be typical enough of all the agencies involved to be applicable to the total NAC system. This led to the discussion of what constituted a "typical routine" name check. It was generally agreed that there are many exceptional cases that require extensive time for a variety of reasons and that these should be excluded from the consideration of this survey. The reason for this is that these are a small proportion of the NAC's being made and are indeed not typical of the general activity and should not bias the figures being developed. The solution to the improvement in this area lies within the internal agency management improvement programs and in any event cannot be affected materially by the automation of either the internal or the interagency systems. The conversation returned to what is a "typical" name check. For example, would a determination that 80% of all the requests with answers within ten days constitute the appropriate body of "typical requests". It was generally agreed that some statistical approach would have to be taken both as to the determination of what a "typical" request is as well as to whether or not the four agencies represented on this working group could by correlation procedures demonstrate that they were typical of the other agencies.

8. The group next pondered the relative importance of the need for standardization of the presently used request forms to achieve any possible improvement of the interagency system. (The Secretary has determined since the meeting that a CODIB working group on this subject met during 1960-61. It met with no success and was abolished by CODIB in August, 1961.) The FBI member indicated that there have been sporadic attempts at the standardization of request forms between DoD and the FBI for some years. The two agencies have had several meetings in the last several months and DoD has told FBI that a new DoD request form will be issued in the next few months. This activity has been taking place in the office of Lt. Col. Ireland. The Secretary mentioned that Lt. Col. Ireland has been invited to this meeting but has been out of town for two weeks. The Team felt it would be useful for Lt. Col. Ireland to be invited to the deliberations of this working group.

9. It was the consensus of the group that probably for the moment the question of standardization of forms might best be deferred until the group could come to grips successfully with its first job, which is to determine some facts about time and service factors. This lead to a contemplation of how best to proceed. Should there be discussion of individual systems? What precise definitions of conditions must be decided upon so that figures can be provided. For example, how can we compare and evaluate the value of the presence and activities of an agent of one agency working in the area of another agency thereby expediting some portions of the flow of the request.

10. In summary, the group decided to do the following: (a) each member will come to the next meeting with a plan for the best way of conducting a test to determine time and service factors; (b) each

- 4 -

member will bring available statistics which might reflect the time now being taken for whatever categories or types of requests that records have been kept on; (c) each member will come prepared to comment on how to define a "typical request"; (d) each member will bring a list (and samples, if available) of the forms now being either used or received by his agency.

Robert M Landau
Robert M. Landau
Secretary

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L